

Toward a Background Independent Quantum Theory of Gravity

Vishnu Jejjala,^{*} Djordje Minic,[†] Chia-Hsiung Tze[‡]

*Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics
Physics Department, Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061, U.S.A.*

Abstract

Any canonical quantum theory can be understood to arise from the compatibility of the statistical geometry of distinguishable observations with the canonical Poisson structure of Hamiltonian dynamics. This geometric perspective offers a novel, background independent non-perturbative formulation of quantum gravity. We invoke a quantum version of the equivalence principle, which requires both the statistical and symplectic geometries of canonical quantum theory to be fully dynamical quantities. Our approach sheds new light on such basic issues of quantum gravity as the nature of observables, the problem of time, and the physics of the vacuum. In particular, the observed numerical smallness of the cosmological constant can be rationalized in this approach.

^{*}vishnu@vt.edu

[†]dminic@vt.edu

[‡]kahong@vt.edu

Quantum theory and the General Theory of Relativity constitute the pillars of modern physics. The difficulty in reconciling the predictions of each with the other signals the fundamental incompleteness of our understanding of Nature. Local quantum field theories, which incorporate the demands of the Special Theory of Relativity into the structure of quantum mechanics, are spectacularly predictive. Incorporating the demands of the General Theory of Relativity into the structure of quantum mechanics should proffer new insights about space, time, matter, and dynamics.

At first glance, a perturbative approach to quantum gravity, such as string theory, assimilates a canonical and pragmatic quantum theory of measurement with the underlying universal physics of the gravitational interaction. By providing a way to compute boundary observables (a generalized S -matrix), string theory serves as a natural candidate for the *definition* of quantum gravity in asymptotically infinite spaces [1]. Yet even its most successful avatar, non-perturbative string theory on asymptotically anti-de Sitter (AdS) backgrounds [2], cannot address the local (or more precisely, quasi-local) questions associated with observers in particular regions of spacetime. More severely, string theory does not as yet provide a background independent formulation of a quantum theory of gravity. In order to compute physically interesting quantities (transition amplitudes, for instance), additional data about the structure of the asymptopia are needed. Indeed, it is still unclear whether it is even reasonable to expect a background independent formulation for theories built out of “ S -matrix-like” observables.

Other paths to quantum gravity [3] have their own obstacles, for example, defining the meaning of time and time evolution, determining the observables appropriate to a background independent formulation of physics, recovering the Standard Model, which is a self-consistent theory of chiral matter, and accounting for the presence of structures at large and small scales, a fact seemingly irreconcilable with the full diffeomorphism invariance of the theory.

Previous constructions rest on the foundation of canonical quantum theory. Therefore, one expects, by hypothesis, to end up with a structure buttressed by the scaffolding of ordinary quantum mechanics. Inspired both by the conceptual and technical challenges of quantum gravity as well as by exciting new data about our cosmological background [4], we have recently proposed a different architecture for quantum gravity [5].

Our analysis is motivated by the conceptual tension in the way results of measurements are treated in quantum mechanics and in general relativity and by the stark contrast between the rigid geometry of canonical quantum theory and the dynamical geometry of spacetime. In the $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ limit, there is a correspondence principle that recovers classical structures. Working *ab initio* from a generalized quantum theory, we seek a suitable limit in which quantum gravity becomes general relativity in a manifest and observable way.

It is well known that standard quantum mechanics is fully captured by the geometry of $\mathbb{CP}^n$ [5, 6], a homogeneous, isotropic, and simply connected Kähler manifold with constant, holomorphic sectional curvature. The rigid structure of $\mathbb{CP}^n$ welds the statistical geometry of distinguishable observations with the canonical Poisson structure of Hamiltonian dynamics. All the main features of quantum mechanics are embodied in $\mathbb{CP}^n$. Thus, the superposition principle is tied to viewing $\mathbb{CP}^n$ as a collection of complex lines passing through the origin. Entanglement arises from the embeddings of the products of two complex projective spaces in a higher dimensional one. The geometric phase stems from the symplectic structure of $\mathbb{CP}^n$. Furthermore,

there is a deep interconnection between the geometric properties of quantum mechanics and the geometry of spacetime. In the $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ limit, the Fisher–Fubini–Study metric on the quantum phase space described by $\mathbb{CP}^n$ reduces to a spatial metric provided that the configuration space for the quantum system under consideration *is* physical space itself. Similarly, the time parameter of the evolution equation can be related to the quantum metric via $\hbar ds = \Delta E dt$, where the dispersion in energy for a given Hamiltonian is determined by ΔE . Finally, the Schrödinger equation is the geodesic equation for an abstract “particle” of Yang–Mills charge moving on $\mathbb{CP}^n = U(n+1)/(U(n) \times U(1))$ in the presence of an effective external field (namely, the $U(n) \times U(1)$ valued curvature two-form), whose source is the Hamiltonian [5, 6].

The above geometric structure of canonical quantum mechanics is beautifully tested by experiment and is highly robust from the geometric point of view. Unlike various past generalizations, our proposal [5] builds gravity into the very foundation of an extended quantum mechanical theory. It does so by making the kinematical structure compatible with the generalized dynamical structure. *The quantum symplectic and metric structure, and therefore the almost complex structure, are themselves fully dynamical.* The underlying physical reason for this more general dynamical framework develops from a quantum version of the equivalence principle, which provides a foundational underpinning for a non-perturbative quantum theory of gravity.

The intuition behind the classical equivalence principle is to demand indistinguishability of a local gravitational field with acceleration. The intuition behind the quantum equivalence principle is to demand the validity of canonical quantum mechanics in every local neighborhood, that is to say, *in the space of quantum events*. Vector fields on a manifold are described locally on tangent spaces, and the dynamics are then patched together. Similarly, we envision a larger geometric structure whose tangent spaces are the canonical Hilbert spaces of quantum mechanics. The tangent spatial transverse metric emerges from the quantum metric, by assuming that the underlying configuration space is space itself. The transverse space is a classical moduli space, the space of inequivalent degenerate vacua of the theory. Time is a measure of the geodesic distance in this general space of statistical events. The nature of time is hence probabilistic. The longitudinal spatial coordinate corresponds to the dimensionality of the tangent Hilbert space.

When the metric and symplectic form on phase space become fully dynamical entities, only individual quantum events make sense observationally. Physics is required to be diffeomorphism invariant in the sense of information geometry provided that the statistical metric and the symplectic structures remain compatible. This condition requires a *strictly* (*i.e.* non-integrable) almost complex structure on the generalized space of quantum events. This extended framework readily implies that the wavefunctions labeling the event space, while still unobservable, are in fact irrelevant. They are as meaningless as coordinates in general relativity. The physics does not rely on such choices. At the basic level, there are only dynamical correlations of quantum events, and the observables are furnished by diffeomorphism invariant quantities in the quantum configuration space. Time evolution is contained in the relational properties of general information metrics. The concept of a vacuum state becomes meaningful only in the presence of an emergent spacetime background consistent with the rigid geometry of the canonical quantum theory.

To find the kinematical arena for this generalized framework, one seeks a coset of $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})$ that locally looks like $\mathbb{CP}^n$ and also allows for mutually compatible metric and symplectic structures, expressed in the existence of a (generally non-integrable) almost complex structure. The nonlinear Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}) = \text{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^{n+1})/\text{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}, \mathbb{C}^n \times \{0\})$, with $n \rightarrow \infty$ fulfills these requirements [7]. This space is a natural generalization of $\mathbb{CP}^n$. The logic here is exactly as in general relativity. Just as we gauge the Lorentz symmetry into the general diffeomorphism group, the Grassmannian is a gauged version of complex projective space, which is the geometric realization of quantum mechanics. As with standard geometric quantum mechanics, the geodesic length on the space of events assigns probabilities. The non-integrability of the almost complex structure translates to the existence only of a *local* notion of time and a local metric on the space of quantum events. The temporal evolution equation locally is the geodesic equation: $du^a/d\tau + \Gamma_{bc}^a u^b u^c = \frac{1}{2E_p} \text{Tr}(H F_b^a) u^b$, where H is the Hamiltonian, Γ_{bc}^a is the affine connection associated with this general metric g_{ab} , and F_{ab} is the $\text{Diff}(\mathbb{C}^{n+1}, \mathbb{C}^n \times \{0\})$ valued curvature two-form. The parameter τ is defined via $\hbar d\tau = 2E_p dt$, with E_p the Planck energy. (This is consistent with the energy-time uncertainty relation.) The geodesic equation follows from the conservation of the energy-momentum tensor, $\nabla_a T^{ab} = 0$. Since both the metric and symplectic data are contained in H and are $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ limits of their quantum counterparts, we have a consistent nonlinear “bootstrap” between the space of quantum events and the generator of the dynamics [5].

The diffeomorphism invariance of the new quantum phase space is explicitly taken into account in the following dynamical scheme:

$$R_{ab} - \frac{1}{2}g_{ab}R - \lambda g_{ab} = T_{ab} \quad (1)$$

($\lambda = \frac{n+1}{\hbar}$ for $\mathbb{CP}^n$; in that case $E_p \rightarrow \infty$). This is the Einstein–Yang–Mills equation on the space of quantum events. Moreover, we must demand for compatibility

$$\nabla_a F^{ab} = \frac{1}{E_p} H u^b. \quad (2)$$

The two equations imply, via the Bianchi identity, a conserved energy-momentum tensor, which together with the conserved “current” $j^a \equiv \frac{1}{2E_p} H u^a$, $\nabla_a j^a = 0$, results in the generalized geodesic Schrödinger equation. As in general relativity, it will be crucial to understand both the local and global features of various solutions to the dynamical equations. The kinematical structure of ordinary quantum mechanics is compatible with our general dynamical formulation, and thus we expect that our formalism is compatible with all known cases in which quantum theories of gravity have been non-perturbatively defined, albeit in *fixed* asymptotic backgrounds (such as string theory in asymptotically *AdS* spaces) [8]. Practical calculational aspects can be related to toy models for deforming the symplectic structure both in the classical and quantum regimes [9].

What determines the actual form(s) of the Hamiltonian? The only requirement is that H should define a canonical quantum mechanical system whose configuration space is space and whose dynamics define a consistent quantum gravity in a flat background. We are aware of only *one* example satisfying this criterion: *Matrix theory* [10]. Thus, our proposal defines a background independent, non-perturbative, holographic formulation of M-theory [5]. At first

sight, the choice of Hamiltonian may appear *ad hoc* given the generality of our scheme. However, through the geodesic form of the Schrödinger equation, H should be viewed as a “charge” and is thus determined in a quantum theory of gravity through the non-trivial topology of the quantum phase space [11]. This may well be the case because the nonlinear Grassmannian, which is the space of events, is not simply connected [7]. One important element of this new approach to quantum gravity is the existence of a correspondence limit between the background independent quantum theory (with a Matrix theory Hamiltonian) and the classical background independent Einstein theory of gravity coupled to matter. This connection is ensured by the emergent property of spacetime in a background independent way.

Finally, let us see how the above approach sheds new light on reconciling the numerical smallness of the vacuum energy (cosmological constant) with respect to the Planck scale [8]. In our framework, the *mean value* of the vacuum energy density is identically *zero* given the diffeomorphism symmetry in the space of quantum events. Locally, the vacuum energy is determined by the quantum theory in the tangent space, which *by construction* is Matrix theory. Unbroken supersymmetry in Matrix theory ensures that the vacuum energy vanishes identically within a given local neighborhood. The obstruction to extending this into a global statement arises from patching together the physics of the tangent spaces at different points in the space of probabilities. The observed value of the cosmological constant has a natural interpretation as a *fluctuation* about the zero mean. It signals the dynamical (cosmological) breaking of supersymmetry.

The magnitude of the fluctuation in the cosmological constant can be estimated by recalling that in the limit when the classical background emerges, we must also recover the standard canonical quantum fluctuations of measurable quantities. The central limit theorem yields the Fisher metric as the unique homogeneous, isotropic, and simply connected metric on the space of distinguishable statistical events. The hypotheses of the central limit theorem require that the number of quantum events be large. Thus, consistent with the law of large numbers, fluctuations obey a Poisson distribution. The fluctuation (measured value) of the cosmological constant $\Delta\Lambda$ is related to its conjugate quantity, the volume of spacetime ΔV , through the uncertainty principle: $\Delta\Lambda \Delta V \sim \hbar$. As the number of quantum events scales as the spacetime volume, $\Delta V \sim \sqrt{V}$; this in turn implies (in natural units) that

$$\Delta\Lambda \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}}, \quad (3)$$

a result consistent with the observed value for the cosmological constant given the observed volume of spacetime [4, 12].

How should we motivate a spacetime volume large enough to accommodate the smallness of the observed vacuum energy? How does Planck scale physics relate to dynamics in the infrared? The spacetime uncertainty relation [13] provides a compelling explanation. In perturbative string theory, modular invariance on the worldsheet translates in target space to the spacetime uncertainty relation: $\Delta T \Delta X_{\text{tr}} \simeq \ell_s^2 \simeq \alpha'$. (Here, T is a timelike direction; X_{tr} is a spacelike direction transverse to the lightcone.) Nonperturbatively, the eleven dimensional Planck length $\ell_p = M_p^{-1}$ and the size of the M-theory circle that extends at large string coupling sets the scale $\alpha' = \ell_p^3/R$. The radius R determines the maximal uncertainty in X_{long} , the longitudinal

direction in the Matrix theory limit, which implies that $\Delta T \Delta X_{\text{tr}} \Delta X_{\text{long}} \simeq \ell_p^3$, a cubic relation consistent with the existence of membranous structures in M-theory [13]. The Planck energy and the geodesic distance on the probability space are related by $\hbar \Delta s = 2E_p \Delta T$. We estimate the line element on the space of probabilities to scale as $ds \simeq e^{-S_{\text{eff}}}$, where S_{eff} denotes the low-energy (Euclidean) effective action for the matter degrees of freedom propagating in an emergent (fixed) spacetime background. The spacetime uncertainty relation becomes

$$\Delta X_{\text{tr}} \Delta X_{\text{long}} \simeq e^{S_{\text{eff}}} \ell_p^2. \quad (4)$$

The product of the ultraviolet cutoff (the maximal uncertainty in the transverse coordinate) and the infrared cutoff (the maximal uncertainty in the longitudinal coordinate) is thus exponentially suppressed compared to the Planck scale. There is a *gravitational see-saw* [14]. Within an emergent spacetime background, at low energies, we locally have a supergravity theory, but there is in general no globally defined supersymmetry. The effective scale of cosmological supersymmetry breaking m_{susy} provides an estimate for the vacuum energy as implied by the gravitational see-saw:

$$\omega^4 \simeq \left(\frac{m_{\text{susy}}^2}{M_p} \right)^4. \quad (5)$$

The cosmological breaking of supersymmetry argues the intimate connection between the volume of spacetime and the observed vacuum energy [14]. In the $\omega \rightarrow 0$ limit, we recover supersymmetry in spacetime and diffeomorphism invariance in the space of quantum events. The numerical smallness of the vacuum energy density is thus consistent with the principle of naturalness in that the vanishing of a dimensionful quantity restores a dynamically broken symmetry.

Acknowledgments

The work of VJ and DM is supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-FG05-92ER40677.

References

- [1] See, for example, T. Banks, *Physics Today*, **57**, 3, 47 (2004), and references therein.
- [2] J. M. Maldacena, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 231 (1998) [*Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **38**, 1113 (1999)]; S. S. Gubser, I. R. Klebanov, and A. M. Polyakov, *Phys. Lett. B* **428**, 105 (1998); E. Witten, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **2**, 253 (1998).
- [3] See, for example, A. Ashtekar, *Ann. Henri Poincare* **4**, S55 (2003), and references therein.
- [4] C. L. Bennett *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 1 (2003); D. N. Spergel *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003).
- [5] D. Minic and C. H. Tze, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 061501 (2003); *Phys. Lett. B* **581**, 111 (2004); hep-th/0401028. This work is a continuation of D. Minic and C. H. Tze, *Phys. Lett. B* **536**, 305 (2002); H. Awata, M. Li, D. Minic, and T. Yoneya, *JHEP* **0102**, 013 (2001); D. Minic, hep-th/9909022; hep-th/0009131.
- [6] B. Mielnik, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **37**, 221 (1974); T. W. Kibble, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **65**, 189 (1979); J. P. Provost and G. Vallee, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **76**, 289 (1980); A. Heslot, *Phys. Rev. D* **31**, 1341 (1985); A. M. Bloch, *Phys. Lett. A* **116**, 353 (1986); J. Anandan and Y. Aharonov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1697 (1990); J. Anandan, *Found. Phys.* **21**, 1265 (1991); R. Cirelli, A. Mania, and I. Pizzocchero, *J. Math. Phys.* **31**, 2891 (1990); S. Weinberg, *Annals Phys.* **194**, 336 (1989); J. Polchinski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 397 (1991); G. W. Gibbons, *J. Geom. Phys.* **8**, 147 (1992); G. W. Gibbons and H. J. Pohle, *Nuc. Phys.* **B410**, 117 (1993); A. Ashtekar and T. A. Schilling, gr-qc/9706069; D. C. Brody and L. P. Hughston, *J. Geom. Phys.* **38**, 19 (2001); [quant-ph/9906086]; W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 357 (1981); N. P. Landsman, *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. B* **10**, 1545 (1996); *Rev. Math. Phys.* **9**, 29 (1997); *Mathematical topics between classical and quantum mechanics*, Springer, New York (1998); and references therein.
- [7] S. Haller and C. Vizman, math.DG/0305089.
- [8] V. Jejjala, D. Minic, and C. H. Tze, manuscript in preparation.
- [9] L. N. Chang, D. Minic, N. Okamura, and T. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 125027 (2002); *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 125028 (2002); S. Benczik, L. N. Chang, D. Minic, N. Okamura, S. Rayyan, and T. Takeuchi, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 026003 (2002); hep-th/0209119.
- [10] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker, and L. Susskind, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 5112 (1997), and references therein.
- [11] J. A. Wheeler, *Geometrodynamics*, Academic Press, New York (1962).
- [12] Similar reasoning was presented in R. D. Sorkin, gr-qc/0309009, where the argument for a zero mean value is apparently lacking.

- [13] M. Li and T. Yoneya, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 1219 (1997); T. Yoneya, Prog. Theor. Phys. **97**, 949 (1997); M. Li and T. Yoneya, hep-th/9806240; D. Minic, Phys. Lett. B **442**, 102 (1998).
- [14] V. Jejjala, R. G. Leigh and D. Minic, JCAP **0306**, 002 (2003); Gen. Rel. Grav. **35**, 2089 (2003). See also T. Banks, hep-th/0007146; P. Berglund, T. Hubsch and D. Minic, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 041901 (2003).